

AO 120 (Rev. 3/04)

TO: Mail Stop 8 Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK
---	---

In Compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been filed in the U.S. District Court Southern District of Indiana on the following ☒ Patents or ☐ Trademarks:

DOCKET NO. 1:08-cv-1689-DFH-JMS	DATE FILED 12/18/2008	U.S. DISTRICT COURT Southern District of Indiana
PLAINTIFF ARRIVALSTAR S.A. and MELVINO TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED,		DEFENDANT LANGHAM LOGISTICS, INC., SUPPLY CHAIN CONSULTING U.S. LLC, MRA TECHNOLOGIES, CORP., OZBURN-HESSEY LOGISTICS, LLC, et al.
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1 See attached.		See attached.
2 7,030,781		
3 6,748,318		
4 6,411,891		
5 6,317,060		

In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s)/ trademark(s) have been included:

DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Answer <input type="checkbox"/> Cross Bill <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pleading	
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1 6,952,164		
2 6,748,320		
3		
4		
5		

In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued:

DECISION/JUDGEMENT

CLERK <i>Paul Briggs</i>	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK <i>Lana B. Kirby</i>	DATE 12/22/2008
-----------------------------	---	--------------------

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Director Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Director
 Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Director Copy 4—Case file copy

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

FILED

DEC 18 2008

U.S. CLERK'S OFFICE
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

ARRIVALSTAR S.A. and MELVINO
TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LANGHAM LOGISTICS, INC.,
SUPPLY CHAIN CONSULTING U.S. LLC,
MRA TECHNOLOGIES, CORP.,
OZBURN-HESSEY LOGISTICS, LLC,
AMTREX TRADING, LLC, and
FORTIGO, INC.

Defendants.

CASE NO.: _____

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1:08-cv-1689 DFH-JMS

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiffs ArrivalStar S.A. and Melvino Technologies Limited (collectively, "ArrivalStar" or "Plaintiffs"), by and through their undersigned attorneys, for their complaint against defendants Langham Logistics, Inc. ("Langham"), Supply Chain Consulting U.S. LLC ("Supply Chain"), MRA Technologies, Corp. ("MRA"), Ozburn-Hessey Logistics, LLC ("OHL"), Amtrex Trading, LLC ("Amtrex") and Fortigo, Inc. ("Fortigo") (Langham, Supply Chain, MRA, OHL, Amtrex and Fortigo are collectively referred to herein as "Defendants"), hereby allege as follows:

NATURE OF LAWSUIT

1. This action involves claims for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. This Court has exclusive jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a).

THE PARTIES

2. ArrivalStar S.A. is a corporation organized under the laws of Luxembourg and having offices at 67 Rue Michel, Welter L-2730, Luxembourg.

3. Melvino Technologies Limited is a corporation organized under the laws of the British Virgin Island of Tortola, having offices at P.O. Box 3152, RG Hodge Building, Road Town, Tortola, British Virgin Islands.

4. Melvino and ArrivalStar S.A. (collectively referred to hereafter as "ArrivalStar") own all right, title and interest in, and have standing to sue for infringement of United States Patent Nos. 7,030,781 ("the '781 patent"), entitled "Notification System and Method that Informs a Party of Vehicle Delay," issued April 18, 2006, United States Patent No. 6,748,318 ("the '318 patent"), entitled "Advanced Notification Systems and Methods Utilizing a Computer Network," issued June 8, 2004, United States Patent No. 6,411,891 ("the '891 patent") entitled "Advance Notification System and Method Utilizing User-Definable Notification Time Periods," issued June 25, 2002, United States Patent No. 6,317,060 ("the '060 patent") entitled "Base Station System and Method for Monitoring Travel of Mobile Vehicles and Communicating Notification Messages," issued November 13, 2001, United States Patent No. 6,952,645 ("the '645 patent") entitled "System and Method for Activation of an Advance Notification System for Monitoring and Reporting Status of Vehicle Travel" issued October 4, 2005, and United States Patent No. 6,748,320 ("the '320 patent"), entitled "Advanced Notification Systems and Methods Utilizing A Computer Network," issued June 8, 2004. Copies of the '781, '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents are annexed hereto as Exhibits A, B, C, D, E and F, respectively.

5. Defendant Langham is an Indiana corporation with a place of business at 5335 West 74th Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46268. Langham transacts business and has, at a

minimum, offered to provide and/or provided in this judicial district and throughout the State of Indiana services that infringe claims of the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents.

6. Defendant Supply Chain is a Virginia, Limited Liability Company with a place of business at 2301 N. Greenville Avenue, Suite 250 Richardson, TX 75082. Supply Chain transacts business and has, at a minimum, offered to provide and/or provided in this judicial district and throughout the State of Indiana services that infringe claims of the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents.

7. Defendant MRA is a California corporation with a place of business at 2502 Park Road, Redwood City, California 94062. MRA transacts business and has, at a minimum, offered to provide and/or provided in this judicial district and throughout the State of Indiana services that infringe claims of the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents.

8. Defendant OHL is a Tennessee Limited Liability Company with a place of business at 7101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 333, Brentwood, Tennessee 37027. OHL transacts business and has, at a minimum, offered to provide and/or provided in this judicial district and throughout the State of Indiana services that infringe claims of the '781, '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents.

9. Defendant Amtrex is a California Limited Liability Company with a place of business at 5000 Birch Street, Suite 8000, Newport Beach, California 92660. Amtrex transacts business and has, at a minimum, offered to provide and/or provided in this judicial district and throughout the State of Indiana services that infringe claims of the '781, '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents.

10. Defendant Fortigo is a Delaware corporation with a place of business at 8310 North Capital of Texas Highway, Suite 325, Austin, Texas 78731. Fortigo transacts business and

has, at a minimum, offered to provide and/or provided in this judicial district and throughout the State of Indiana services that infringe claims of the '781, '318, '891, '060 and '645 patents.

11. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b).

DEFENDANT LANGHAM'S ACTS OF PATENT INFRINGEMENT

12. Defendant Langham has infringed claims of the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents through, among other activities, the use of the "Transportation Management System" and the "Warehouse Management System" which are components of Langham's logistics solutions. Langham has also infringed the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents by knowingly and actively inducing others to infringe and by contributing to the infringement by others of, such patents.

13. Defendant Langham's infringement, contributory infringement and inducement to infringe has injured and will continue to injure ArrivalStar unless and until this Court enters an injunction prohibiting further infringement and, specifically, enjoining further use of methods and systems that come within the scope of the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents.

DEFENDANT SUPPLY CHAIN'S ACTS OF PATENT INFRINGEMENT

14. Defendant Supply Chain has infringed claims of the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents through, among other activities, the use of the Viewlocity Logistics Management package and the Shipment Visibility system. Supply Chain has also infringed the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents by knowingly and actively inducing others to infringe and by contributing to the infringement by others of, such patents.

15. Defendant Supply Chain's infringement, contributory infringement and inducement to infringe has injured and will continue to injure ArrivalStar unless and until this Court enters an injunction prohibiting further infringement and, specifically, enjoining further

use of methods and systems that come within the scope of the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents.

DEFENDANT MRA'S ACTS OF PATENT INFRINGEMENT

16. Defendant MRA has infringed claims of the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents through, among other activities, the use of MRA's "Mail & Package Tracking Systems" including the "Internal Tracking Software" solution. MRA has also infringed the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents by knowingly and actively inducing others to infringe and by contributing to the infringement by others of, such patents.

17. Defendant MRA's infringement, contributory infringement and inducement to infringe has injured and will continue to injure ArrivalStar unless and until this Court enters an injunction prohibiting further infringement and, specifically, enjoining further use of methods and systems that come within the scope of the '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents.

DEFENDANT OHL'S ACTS OF PATENT INFRINGEMENT

18. Defendant OHL has infringed claims of the '781, '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents through, among other activities, the use of the OHL "e-Focus" "end-to-end global supply chain visibility tool." OHL has also infringed the '781, '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents by knowingly and actively inducing others to infringe and by contributing to the infringement by others of, such patents.

19. Defendant OHL's infringement, contributory infringement and inducement to infringe has injured and will continue to injure ArrivalStar unless and until this Court enters an injunction prohibiting further infringement and, specifically, enjoining further use of methods and systems that come within the scope of the '781, '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents.

DEFENDANT AMTREX'S ACTS OF PATENT INFRINGEMENT

20. Defendant Amtrex has infringed claims of the '781, '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents through, among other activities, the use of the HALO and Intelliship components of the Amtrex system. Amtrex has also infringed the '781, '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents by knowingly and actively inducing others to infringe and by contributing to the infringement by others of, such patents.

21. Defendant Amtrex's infringement, contributory infringement and inducement to infringe has injured and will continue to injure ArrivalStar unless and until this Court enters an injunction prohibiting further infringement and, specifically, enjoining further use of methods and systems that come within the scope of the '781, '318, '891, '060, '645 and '320 patents.

DEFENDANT FORTIGO'S ACTS OF PATENT INFRINGEMENT

22. Defendant Fortigo has infringed claims of the '781, '318, '891, '060 and '645 patents through, among other activities, the use of the "Exceptions Monitor" and "Visibility Network" components of the Fortigo logistics solution. Fortigo has also infringed the '781, '318, '891, '060 and '645 patents by knowingly and actively inducing others to infringe and by contributing to the infringement by others of, such patents.

23. Defendant Fortigo's infringement, contributory infringement and inducement to infringe has injured and will continue to injure ArrivalStar unless and until this Court enters an injunction prohibiting further infringement and, specifically, enjoining further use of methods and systems that come within the scope of the '781, '318, '891, '060 and '645 patents.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs ask this Court to enter judgment against Defendants, and against their subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, servants, employees and all persons in active concert or participation with them, granting the following relief:

- A. An award of damages adequate to compensate ArrivalStar for the infringement that has occurred, together with prejudgment interest from the date that Defendant's infringement of the ArrivalStar patents began;
- B. Increased damages as permitted under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- C. A finding that this case is exceptional and an award to ArrivalStar of its attorneys' fees and costs as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 285;
- D. A permanent injunction prohibiting further infringement, inducement and contributory infringement of the ArrivalStar Patents; and
- E. Such other and further relief as this Court or a jury may deem proper and just.

JURY DEMAND

ArrivalStar demands a trial by jury on all issues presented in this Complaint.

Dated: December 18, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony E. Dowell
aedowell@dowellbaker.com
Geoffrey D. Smith
gsmith@dowellbaker.com
DOWELL BAKER, P.C.
201 Main St., Suite 710
Lafayette, IN 47901
(765) 429-4004
(765) 429-4114 (fax)

**ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS
ARRIVALSTAR S.A. and
MELVINO TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED**